



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,890	03/23/2004	Allan Havemose	P1639US01	2390
32709 7590 04/24/2008 GATEWAY, INC. ATTN: PATENT ATTORNEY 610 GATEWAY DRIVE N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049				
EXAMINER				
TO, JENNIFER N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2195				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,890

Applicant(s)

HAVEMOSE, ALLAN

Examiner

JENNIFER N. TO

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 8-11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by hyperDRIVE: Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" by BARTZ.

4. BARTZ was cited in the previous office action.

5. As to claim 8, BARTZ teaches a method for accessing contents of a resource (invoking a business service) by a user (client), comprising:

accessing a resource which requires registration by a user (via the business data services verify that the user is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column);

when the resource supports universal registration and the user is universally registered, obtaining registration information from a registration dynamic object (LDAP server / directory server) (via the business data services verify that the user

Art Unit: 2195

is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); and

allowing the user to access contents of the resource (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

6. As to claim 9, BARTZ teaches when the resource fails to support universal registration and the user utilizes a registration dynamic base object, registering the user by the registration dynamic base object per pre-registered user data (via the user sends its distinguished name to the business service such that it verifies the user has access by comparing it to the one stored on the LDAP server wherein the act of authorization and authentication are separate activities, thus they occur at different times, SEE PG. 70, 4th – 6th paragraphs). The cited teachings of BARTZ, inherently teach allowing the registration to occur after the requesting access and dynamically change how the resources are protected (pg. 70, second column, behavioral summary).

7. As to claim 10, BARTZ teaches when the resource supports universal registration and the user is not universally registered, entering registration information by the user (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP

Art Unit: 2195

server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

8. As to claim 11, BARTZ teaches the registration information includes a name (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column). It is inherent that in order to authenticate with a server, the client has to send its.

9. As to claims 15-18, reference is made to a computer readable medium that corresponds to the method of claims 8-11 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 8-11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-7 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over hyperDRIVE: Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" by BARTZ.

12. BARZT was cited in the previous office action.

Art Unit: 2195

13. As to claim 1, BARTZ teaches the invention substantially as claim including a method for providing universal registration, comprising:

providing user registration information of a user to a universal registration resource (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column), the user registration information (distinguished name / user authentication information) accessible by providers of resources (via the business data services verify that the user is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); and

requesting use of a provider resource which requires the user registration information, wherein the provider resource automatically retrieves the user registration information from the universal registration resource to enable the user to access the provider resource (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

14. However, BARTZ does not teach that the network is an information appliance network. Official Notice is taken in that such a network is well known in the art, and since BARTZ teaches that the invention is implemented in Java for its "write once, run anywhere" quality it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the

Art Unit: 2195

invention is applicable to an information appliance network since the code can run anywhere.

15. As to claims 2-6, BARTZ teaches the user registration information is contained in a program object (via the role objects / DN (object describing people) being stored in the LDAP server which is a directory (see pg 70, Behavioral Summary and pg. 72 first and second columns). The cited reference does not detail that the name or object is in a string naming convention, however, Official Notice is taken in that object names, distinguished names are in a string naming convention that details the location of the object, the object name, and a method of the object and therefore it would be obvious that the distinguished names or other authentication information provided is in this format to be compared with the business services retrieved authentication information for the user to see if the user is permitted to access the service.

16. As to claim 7, BARTZ teaches the registration information includes a name (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column). It is inherent that in order to authenticate with a server, the client has to send its name.

17. As to claims 12 and 13, BARTZ teaches the invention substantially as claim including a system for universal registration comprising:

a digital information server for sending a registration interface dynamic base object (authenticated distinguished name reference to the LDAP directory object) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second columns; in particular item 1);

a universal register (LDAP server) for hosting a registration implementation dynamic base object (role objects), the registration implementation dynamic base object corresponding to the registration interface dynamic base object (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column, in particular item 9);

a resource (server), communicatively coupled to the digital information server and the universal register via a network, requiring user registration (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); and wherein using the registration implementation dynamic base object (role objects) to provide user registration information, a user of the digital information server gains access to contents of the resource (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

18. However, BARTZ does not teach that the network is an information appliance network. Official Notice is taken in that such a network is well known in the art, and

Art Unit: 2195

since BARTZ teaches that the invention is implemented in Java for its "write once, run anywhere" quality it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the invention is applicable to an information appliance network since the code can run anywhere.

19. As to claim 14, BARTZ teaches the registration information includes a name (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column). It is inherent that in order to authenticate with a server, the client has to send its name.

20. Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over hyperDRIVE: Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" by BARZT, and in view of DANCS et al. (hereafter DANCS) (U.S. Patent No. 6385651).

21. BARZT was cited in the previous office action.

22. As per claim 19, BARZT teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. BARZT did not specifically teach that said requesting further comprises determining that the provider resource does not have said user registration information.

23. However, DANCS teaches determining that the provider resource does not have said user registration information (col. 11, lines 14-45).

Art Unit: 2195

24. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of BARZT and DANCS because DANCS teaching of determining that the provider resource does not have said user registration information would improve the integrity of by providing a security paradigm for effectively managing appliance interaction in a distributed computing environment.

25. As per claim 20, DANCS teaches that wherein the requesting use of the provider resource is a first time request for the use of the provider resource (col. 11, line 40 through col. 12, line 28).

26. As per claims 21-24, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 19-20 above.

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments filed 01/22/2008 with respect to claims 1-18 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

28. In the remark, applicant argued with respect to claims 1, and 15 that (1) BARZT fails to teach a user may enter registration information into the universal registration resource when utilizing a digital information appliance the first time or later when desiring to utilize charged content resources; (2) BARZT does not use that registration information authorize subsequent access; (3) BARZT fails to teach

Art Unit: 2195

wherein said provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said provider resource (4) when said resource supports universal registration and said user is universally registered, obtaining registration information from a registration dynamic object.

29. Examiner respectful disagreed with applicant.

As to point (1), applicant argued that BARZT fails to teach a user may enter registration information into the universal registration resource when utilizing a digital information appliance the first time or later when desiring to utilize charged content resources. However this limitation is not claimed in claims 1, and 15.

As to point (2), claims 1, and 15 never stated or cited specifically that the registration information authorize subsequent access as argued by applicant.

As to point (3), applicant argued that BARZT fails to teach wherein said provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said provider resource by pointing out that the registration information of BARZT is pre-registered information and not dynamic register information as claimed in claims 1, 15.

Examiner disagreed with applicant because according to the claimed language of claims 1, and 15, the registration information could be both pre-register information or dynamically register information. In this case, BARZT is pre-register information. Thus, BARZT still meet the language of claims 1, 15. Therefore, BARZT clearly teaches wherein said provider resource automatically retrieves said user registration

Art Unit: 2195

information from said universal registration resource to enable said user to access said provider resource (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

As to point (4), BARZT clearly teaches (LDAP server / directory server) (via the business data services verify that the user is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

Conclusion

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see attached PTO 892 form for details).

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from

Art Unit: 2195

the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER N. TO whose telephone number is (571)272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

33. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

34. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

Art Unit: 2195

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195